COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

This instruction implements AFPD 13-2, *Air Traffic Control, Airspace, Airfield, and Range Management.* It provides guidance and procedures for conducting the evaluation of the air traffic system's safety, effectiveness, and compliance with HQ USAF and FAA standards. It outlines the frequency of evaluations, responsibilities of Major Command (MAJCOM) evaluation team members, and reporting format. The reporting requirements in this directive (**Chapter 5**) are exempt from licensing in accordance with paragraph 2.11.10 of AFI 33-324, *The Information Collections and Reports Management Program; Controlling Internal, Public, and Interagency Air Force Information Collections.* HQ Air Force Flight Standards Agency, Director of Airfield Operations (AFFSA/XA) must approve all MAJCOM supplements and interim changes to previously approved supplements to this directive prior to implementation.

(AFMC) AFI 13-218, 10 October 2003, is supplemented as follows:

(AFMC) This supplement applies to AFMC activities that operate, administer, and maintain an airfield management/base operation function, an air traffic control (ATC) or navigational aid facility, and includes the operation of a Radar Control Facility (RCF). It does not apply to the Air National Guard or US Air Force Reserve units and members except as outlined in memorandums of understanding. Base-level supplements to this directive require MAJCOM approval and must be forwarded to HQ AFMC/DOB.

SUMMARY OF REVISIONS

This document is substantially revised and must be completely reviewed.

Changes include: clarifies unit role (paragraph **1.1.3.**) and ATSEP objectives (paragraph **1.2.**); recognizes the value of optional application at extended contingency locations (paragraph **1.4.3.**); allows a plus or

minus 12-month adjustment to the standard evaluation interval (paragraph **2.1.1.**); adds policy for evaluating contract locations or functions (paragraph **2.1.3.**); deletes the requirement for knowledge testing, but leaves an option and guidelines for MAJCOMs (paragraph **2.5.**); expands options for Special Interest Items and changes reporting procedures (paragraph **3.3.**); adds procedures for observation closure (paragraph **3.4.1.**); adds standard functional area identifiers for compliance evaluations and deletes reference to Mobility Preparedness checklist (paragraph **4.1.**); removes the compliance checklists from attachments and implements a web-based method for distribution (paragraph **4.2.**); simplifies the standard problem closure process and allows validating closure of open problems during subsequent evaluations (paragraph **4.3.**); adds restrictions on unit ATSEP report contents (paragraph **5.1.2.**); mandates observation tracking numbers (paragraph **5.2.2.2.1.**); defines "repeat observation" and the tracking process (paragraph **5.2.2.2.2.**); adds automated reporting procedures (paragraph **5.3.**); adds list of references and terms (**Attachment 1**).

(AFMC) This document is substantially revised and must be completely reviewed.

Chapter 1

DESCRIPTION OF THE AIR TRAFFIC SYSTEM EVALUATION PROGRAM

1.1. Air Traffic System Evaluation Program (ATSEP). The ATSEP evaluates the ability of the air traffic system to meet standards and operational requirements of military and civil users. All USAF, USAF Reserve, Air National Guard (to include DOD and contract locations, as applicable) and host nation locations (where USAF has functional responsibility) are subject to this program.

1.1.1. HQ AFFSA/XA is responsible for ATSEP policy, Special Interest Items (SII), compliance checklists and trend reporting. Additionally, HQ AFFSA/XARS provides USAF-level management of the ATSEP and may, as prior coordinated, either observe or augment MAJCOM evaluation teams.

1.1.2. MAJCOM airfield operations staffs are responsible to implement and manage ATSEP for units within their command, to include scheduling evaluations, reporting results and providing oversight to resolve identified deficiencies. MAJCOM staffs should continually review applicable evaluation tools (AF Special Interest Items and Functional Area Checklists listed on HQ AFFSA's web site) to ensure currency and accuracy. MAJCOMs should forward recommended changes to HQ AFFSA/XARS.

1.1.3. Units use the standard ATSEP evaluation tools as the basis of their self-inspection program and to prepare for subsequent evaluations; trend reports also provide valuable insights to common system deficiencies. Units provide support to ATSEP teams as requested by MAJCOM.

1.2. Program Objectives. Analyze from an operational viewpoint the total air traffic system for safety, compatibility and adequacy. Evaluate all pertinent areas that are a part of, or affect, the air traffic system for compliance with regulatory guidance. Resolve identified deficiencies at appropriate command echelons. Identify emergent trends from unit reports and apply corrective attention AF-wide. Provide MAJCOMs and units a means of self-evaluation and improvement.

1.3. Program Scope. Evaluate the quality of service and support (e.g., Weather, Civil Engineering (CE), Safety Office, Airspace Management) provided to air traffic system users and compliance with standards by Air Traffic Control (ATC), Airfield Management (AM) and Air Traffic Control and Landing Systems (ATCALS) Maintenance.

1.4. Scheduling Evaluations.

1.4.1. MAJCOMs will conduct ATSEP evaluations where they have functional responsibility (to include host nation locations) for ATC, AM or ATCALS. MAJCOMs will forward a copy of their annual (fiscal year) ATSEP schedule to HQ AFFSA/XARS by 1 August each year and provide schedule changes as they occur.

1.4.2. MAJCOMs will notify the Wing Commander (WG/CC), Operations Group Commander (OG/CC) or equivalent operational commander and the Mission Support Group Commander (MSG/CC) of the scheduled evaluation not later than 60 days prior to the event. This notification will include evaluation dates, a list of ATSEP team requirements (i.e., office space, computer support, and phones), a request for any locally identified items requiring special attention and ATSEP questionnaires (as determined and created by the MAJCOMs) along with instructions for their distribution, completion and collection. The OG/CC and MSG/CC will acknowledge receipt and advise MAJCOM, not later than 30 days prior to scheduled evaluation date, of any requirements that cannot be met.

1.4.2. (AFMC) Copies of notification letters will be sent to the OSS/CC, CS or CG/CC, base SEF and CE community planner office.

1.4.3. Although ATSEP does not normally apply to contingency operations, MAJCOMs may conduct and report evaluations where the appropriate Air Force Forces (AFFOR) commander requests. This option has proven useful to help improve air traffic system elements at locations with protracted and sustained contingency operations. Reporting procedures in this AFI may be modified by agreement between MAJCOM and AFFOR.

Chapter 2

CONDUCTING THE AIR TRAFFIC SYSTEM EVALUATION PROGRAM

2.1. Conducting the Evaluation. ATSEP evaluations consist of two distinct, but related, components that are normally conducted simultaneously: a system evaluation (**Chapter 3**) and a compliance evaluation (**Chapter 4**). Follow the guidelines established in this AFI using all applicable regulatory guidance and compliance checklists. Evaluators will: observe airfield operations; interview key personnel from wing organizations and adjacent airports; review local airfield procedures and documentation; and evaluate ATCALS Maintenance, Weather, CE and Safety Office support. MAJCOM ATCALS Maintenance, CE, Safety, and Weather personnel should participate as ATSEP team members to ensure an in-depth evaluation of system support functions.

2.1.1. An evaluation will normally be conducted at each location every 24 months. MAJCOMs may conduct ATSEP evaluations concurrently with other evaluations and inspections that address the same functional areas (e.g., Air Force Weather Standardization and Evaluation Program or Inspector General inspections). Evaluation frequency may be adjusted to support reducing the inspection "footprint" if the ATSEP is combined with other inspection/evaluation programs and for operational reasons at the discretion of the MAJCOM. These evaluation interval adjustments shall be limited to plus or minus 12 months. In those unusual cases when ATSEP system and compliance evaluations are conducted separately, each type must be completed within the maximum 36-month interval.

2.1.2. For any particular evaluation, the ATSEP team composition and scope of the evaluation will depend primarily on levels of USAF functional responsibility within that air traffic system. MAJCOMs should build teams with full representation of the functional areas subject to evaluation. The ATSEP team must be able to conduct an in-depth evaluation ranging from a comprehensive analysis of all air traffic system components to completion of the compliance checklists.

2.1.3. A system evaluation is appropriate to contracted locations or functions, whereas a compliance evaluation should only be applied in accordance with the performance work standard or statement of work. If MAJCOMs have direct functional (ATC, AM or ATCALS) oversight of Quality Assurance Evaluators (QAEs) and those QAEs periodically conduct on-site evaluations using MAJCOM-approved checklists, this meets the intent of the evaluation program and a formal system evaluation is not required. Alternatively, MAJCOMs may seek cooperative agreements with the FAA Air Traffic Evaluations Division, AAT-100, to evaluate ATC service contracts.

2.1.4. (Added-AFMC) AFMC/DOB develops questionnaires for pilots, air traffic controllers, AM Operations, weather, and ATCALS Maintenance. Questionnaires are mailed to the unit along with the ATSE notification letter. The AOF/CC will distribute copies of the questionnaires, collect the completed questionnaires, and protect the information until given to the ATSEP Team Chief. Questionnaires may be completed by electronic means (web site or e-mail) as long as the completed documents remain confidential. AOF/CCs should attempt to obtain as many questionnaires as possible to provide a representative sampling of input from system users.

2.2. Team In-brief. The Airfield Operations Flight Commander (AOF/CC) will coordinate and schedule the in-brief. The OG/CC will ensure members of the Airfield Operations Board (AOB) and MSG/CC or representative attend the in-brief. The ATSEP team chief will provide information that covers at least the following topics:

2.2.1. Introduction of team members.

2.2.2. Overview of ATSEP evaluation and reporting.

2.2.3. Applicable SIIs and the evaluation process.

2.2.4. Definition of an observation and closure process.

2.2.5. Definition of a problem and closure process.

2.2.6. Process for daily review of identified/potential deficiencies.

2.3. Daily Briefings. The ATSEP team chief or designated representative shall brief the AOF/CC daily on the progress of the evaluation. This briefing should include any observations, problems identified, status of SIIs and other areas of interest. The team chief or designated representative will brief affected squadron commanders or their designated representatives, as required. Additionally, team members will brief their unit counterparts on all identified or potential deficiencies and concerns each day.

2.4. Team Out-brief. The AOF/CC will coordinate and schedule the final out-brief. The ATSEP team chief will out-brief ATSEP results to the OG/CC (or wing representative), MSG/CC (or representative) and concerned base agency representatives, as required. The following information must be briefed (as a minimum):

2.4.1. Overall assessment of the air traffic system. Make specific note of strengths and weaknesses.

2.4.2. Results of special interest items evaluated.

2.4.3. Observations. Identify all observations and indicate urgency of resolution.

2.4.4. Problems. Identify the number of problems found and define relative impact of noncompliance, i.e., aircraft separation errors vs. minor administrative oversight.

2.4.5. Required follow-up actions. Explain when the unit should expect the report, the contents of the report, reply instructions and the tracking and closing processes.

2.5. Knowledge Testing. If required by the MAJCOM, evaluators may administer general knowledge tests to gauge the comprehension level of the respective functional areas and for trend analysis purposes. Additionally, civilian contractors and DOD AM and ATC civilians may be required to test. MAJCOMs should develop tests that include items applicable to all personnel within the functional area and local knowledge areas for each unit. If tests are administered, MAJCOMs should annually review each test question to ensure valid references, proper construction and organization.

2.5.1. (Added-AFMC) AFMC ATSEP program tests all personal (except 3-levels) assigned to air traffic control operations, AM operations, and ATCALS maintenance functions. No names are used during testing, and results are provided to the appropriate unit office for use in remedial training.

2.5.2. (Added-AFMC) AFMC/DOB develops and controls ATSEP tests.

2.6. Follow-up Evaluations. A follow-up evaluation may be conducted as deemed necessary by the MAJCOM staff. Normally, this determination will be based on the number and potential/actual impact of system deficiencies (observations and problems) identified during the ATSEP. If a follow-up evaluation is required, it will be completed within 12 months of the ATSEP. During follow-up evaluations, team members will assess wing/unit progress in correcting deficiencies and offer further recommendations, as appli-

cable, to assist with the closure process. Evaluators will review documented action taken to correct previously identified deficiencies and confirm closure for those deficiencies that have been resolved. Follow-up evaluations may be accomplished by an on-site visit or desk audit. MAJCOMs will advise the OG/CC and MSG/CC at least 30 days prior to conducting an on-site follow-up evaluation.

Chapter 3

SYSTEM EVALUATION

3.1. Evaluation Areas. Observe all applicable air traffic system elements for safety, compatibility and adequacy from an operational viewpoint. The following areas, as a minimum, must be considered:

3.1.1. Air traffic control operations.

3.1.2. Airspace management and configuration.

3.1.3. Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPS).

3.1.4. Interface with adjoining air traffic facilities.

3.1.5. Airfield Management.

3.1.6. Air Traffic Control and Landing Systems (ATCALS) maintenance support.

3.1.7. Civil engineering support of ATC, AM, ATCALS, and TERPS requirements (i.e., CE maps, airfield obstruction/waiver program, airfield signs/markings, auxiliary power, facility grounding and lightning protection).

3.1.8. Safety awareness programs: public relations, Midair Collision Avoidance (MACA) program, Bird/Wildlife Aircraft Strike Hazard (BASH) program.

3.1.9. Weather support (e.g., cooperative weather watch and tower visibility reporting).

3.1.10. Specialized requirements (local directives).

3.2. Determining and Reporting Observations. Observations are system deficiencies that clearly indicate actual or potential flying mission impact or an adverse affect on flight safety. Annotate significant issues identified during this comprehensive analysis in the ATSEP report as observations when the unit can, at least, initiate actions towards resolution. Each observation must contain the following elements:

3.2.1. Observation. The observation statement must clearly state the deficiency and define the mission impact or safety of flight implications.

3.2.2. Discussion. The discussion should contain information that supports the observation. The discussion is also the appropriate place to include unit or wing input.

3.2.3. Recommendation. The recommendation should indicate any possible means to correct the deficiency and specifically address the agency/office best able to correct the deficiency. Recommendations will be based on previous successful actions to close observations or best practices learned through experience.

3.3. Special Interest Items. Special Interest Items focus attention and corrective action on relatively common, significant issues in air traffic systems. HQ AFFSA/XA identifies annual ATSEP SIIs using trend data from the previous year's ATSEP reports and by anticipating emergent issues with potential mission impact. Once HQ AFFSA/XA has proposed SIIs, MAJCOMs will coordinate to ensure validity and applicability. AF-level SIIs are evaluated during a system evaluation using a checklist developed by AFFSA/XARS. SIIs will be rated either satisfactory or unsatisfactory based on criteria in the checklist. Each unsatisfactory SII shall result in a single, corresponding observation.

3.3.1. Because some SII checklists must be evaluated subjectively, one or more unsatisfactory item(s) in the body of the checklist does not automatically render the entire SII unsatisfactory. The SII would only be unsatisfactory if the extent and gravity of deficiencies have mission impact or safety of flight implications, i.e., justify an observation.

3.3.2. MAJCOMs may develop and manage MAJCOM-specific SIIs as deemed necessary; however, each must be developed based on the same evaluation criteria as AF-level SIIs, i.e., an unsatisfactory SII merits and results in a corresponding observation. MAJCOM developed SIIs must be sent to HQ AFFSA/XA for review prior to implementation.

3.3.3. SII checklists contain questions that should be used by units to conduct self-inspections. Units also report the results of new AF or MAJCOM SII checklists, including SIIs carried over from the previous year, IAW AFI 13-204.

3.4. Observation Resolution Instructions. MAJCOM/DO is the closure authority for observations; this authority may be delegated to expedite the closure process. The OG/CC shall convene the AOB within 30 days after receiving the ATSEP report to address observations and actions taken to resolve deficiencies. The AOB is the primary forum for resolving observations. AOB meeting minutes shall reflect action taken or planned for each observation and include the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) for each reported item. Status of open observations and their estimated closure dates shall be reflected in AOB meeting minutes until actions are complete. Recommendations for closure will be noted in the AOB meeting minutes and forwarded to MAJCOM OPR for airfield operations. AOB meeting minutes shall be marked "FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY" when they repeat or paraphrase observations in the ATSEP report.

3.4.1. An observation cannot be closed until the core issues that warrant the observation have been fully resolved and management action has been taken to prevent recurrence of these significant issues. Requests for closure of ATSEP observations must include these two elements.

3.4.1.1. Implementation. Explain the measures/activities accomplished to ensure appropriate resolution action was initiated and completed.

3.4.1.2. Management Control. Explain the management control plan or action implemented to prevent recurrence of the conditions that warranted the observation.

3.4.2. MAJCOM/DO staff should coordinate with appropriate collateral staff agencies for assistance in determining correct resolutions regarding observation deficiencies outside their area of responsibility. The MAJCOM airfield operations staff will notify the wing in writing of observation closure approval and forward a copy (written or electronic) to HQ AFFSA/XARS. Actions completed and official approval notification should be the final AOB meeting minutes entry for each observation closed.

3.5. (Added-AFMC) ATSEP Observations Will Be Closed Using The Following Procedure:

3.5.1. (Added-AFMC) The OPR for closing the observation will prepare an AF Form 1768, **Staff Summary Sheet (SSS)**. OPRs will submit a SSS for each individual Observation request. See example at **Attachment 3 (Added)**. Route the SSS as follows:

3.5.1.1. (Added-AFMC) From OPR for closing the ATSEP Observation to the AOF/CC for coordination. (**Note:** all Observations from outside the AOF will be coordinated through the appropriate squadron/group level prior to being submitted to the AOF/CC).

3.5.1.2. (Added-AFMC) OSS/CC for coordination.

3.5.1.3. (Added-AFMC) OG/CC or ABW/CC for coordination.

3.5.1.4. (Added-AFMC) Forward to AFMC/DOB for coordination.

3.5.1.5. (Added-AFMC) AFMC/DOB will forward to AFMC/DO for closure approval.

NOTE: Tab all supporting data and documentation. This information must support closure of the ATSEP observation.

3.5.2. (Added-AFMC) Closure packages may be electronically transmitted to **mailto:hqafmc.dob@wpafb.af.mil**.

Chapter 4

COMPLIANCE EVALUATION

4.1. Evaluation Areas. Specific functional areas will be evaluated for compliance with applicable USAF, FAA and MAJCOM requirements. These include the following:

4.1.1. Airfield Operations Management.

4.1.2. Airfield Management.

4.1.3. Air Traffic Control Operations and Training.

4.1.4. Air Traffic Control Automation System.

4.1.5. Terminal Instrument Procedures.

4.1.6. Air Traffic Control and Landing Systems maintenance support.

4.1.7. Additional functional areas determined applicable by MAJCOMs (e.g., civil engineering support, weather services and safety awareness programs).

4.2. ATSEP Checklists. Evaluators will use the downloadable Functional Area Checklists (FAC) available on the AFFSA Airfield Operations Directorate website to evaluate compliance with established guidance and standards. A FAC is not regulatory; it only restates or paraphrases existing compliance requirements. Although not a part of this AFI, every FAC will be coordinated with applicable MAJCOM functional staffs prior to publishing. MAJCOMs will be notified via message when new checklists are posted on the AFFSA website. Each FAC is dated and should be immediately available to units for self-inspection purposes. These checklists are by no means comprehensive and may be supplemented by MAJCOMs. MAJCOMs also determine when a new FAC is effective for ATSEP evaluations, based on scheduling and reference requirements. MAJCOMs will notify units when new checklists are posted and the effective date of implementation.

4.2.1. Each FAC is structured with an operational, training, quality assurance and administration section. Compliance items are arranged into these sections based on subjective content and relative importance. Individual checklist items in the "Operations" section are generally more critical to mission success than others, e.g., those in the "Administration" section.

4.2.2. All applicable checklist items should be evaluated; those that do not apply shall be marked "Not Applicable" (N/A). Checklist items that are applicable, but cannot be evaluated due to unforeseen circumstances (e.g., continual bad weather at a tower only location or time constraints) must be annotated as "Not Observed" (N/O) and, therefore, not included in the results section of the ATSEP report.

4.2.3. Problems. Problems are FAC items determined to be unsatisfactory at the time they are evaluated, indicating noncompliance with established standards. MAJCOM supplemental requirements to standard FAC items that make an existing reference more restrictive are included in this definition. A problem or group of problems may also relate directly to, or be a significant part of, an observation in the ATSEP report if it meets the requirement of paragraph **3.3.**

4.2.4. Off-Checklist Problems (OCP). An off-checklist problem indicates non-compliance with regulatory guidance, including basic AF and FAA references, that is identified through a means other than

the FACs provided by HQ AFFSA. MAJCOM supplemental requirements that are additional to existing FAC references (rather than simply making a standard requirement more restrictive) are considered OCPs. An OCP is not, by nature, any less significant than a problem derived from a FAC. It is important to inform the unit of these problems and to track them for possible adverse trends. AFFSA/XARS will analyze off-checklist problems for trends and may add related checklist items to FACs.

4.3. Problem and Off-Checklist Problem Resolution Instructions. MAJCOMs determine problem closure authority and provide coordination procedures to units. Notify the wing in writing (physical or electronic) of approved closure actions and forward a copy to HQ AFFSA/XARS.

4.3.1. Subsequent to a compliance evaluation, either the AOF/CC or the Systems Flight Commander (or equivalent responsible for ATCALS maintenance) shall initiate respective problem closure request as directed by MAJCOM. Most problems must be monitored for a sufficient time to ensure management controls prevent recurrence.

4.3.1.1. (Added-AFMC) Problem closure requests must contain a description of the corrective action taken to eliminate the deficiency and if applicable, the management control action implemented to prevent reoccurrence. Include appropriate substantiating documentation if appropriate. For example; excerpts from LOPs, crew evaluations, etc., which document the corrected action. Corrective procedures must be implemented and a reasonable time period of testing accomplished before submitting closure action.

4.3.1.2. (Added-AFMC) The AOF/CC is the focal point for problem closures. OPRs for problems outside the AOF will provide a complete package for closure to the AOF/CC. The AOF/CC will coordinate closure requests and forward to the OSS/CC for concurrence. Forward requests for closure written or electronically to HQ AFMC/DOB.

4.3.1.3. (Added-AFMC) AFMC/DOB will advise units of approval/disapproval of closure requests in writing. In addition, AFMC/DOB maintains a listing of problem status on their website.

4.3.2. Problems and OCPs remaining open from prior reports may be closed by the MAJCOM during a subsequent compliance evaluation if the ATSEP team finds the items satisfactory. Notify HQ AFFSA/XARS, in writing or electronically, of any problems or OCPs closed by this method. A list of validated, closed problems included in the ATSEP report satisfies this notification requirement.

4.3.2.1. (Added-AFMC) Problems which are open at the beginning of an ATSEP will not be carried over into the next report. Any open problems will either be reevaluated as closed or if still unsatisfactory, identified in the report with a new tracking number and the word "REPEAT".

4.4. (Added-AFMC) Conformity Index (CI). The CI is a weighted percentage of satisfactory versus unsatisfactory checklist items. Only checklist items published by HQ AFFSA are used to determine the CI. The AOF and ATCALS Maintenance will each receive a CI which will be published in the final report. The CI is determined using the following example:

Operations   % of satisfactory checklist items X 50% =

Training   % of satisfactory checklist items X 25% =

Quality Assurance   % of satisfactory checklist items X 15% =

Administration   % of satisfactory checklist items X 10% =

$$\textbf{CI =}$$

Example:

414 Checklist Items Evaluated - 11 Problems

Operations   191/196 X 50% = 49

Training   136/141 X 25% = 24

Quality Assurance   51/52 X 15% = 15

Administration   25/25 X 10% = 10

$$\textbf{CI = 98}$$

Chapter 5

AIR TRAFFIC SYSTEM EVALUATION PROGRAM REPORTS

5.1. Responsibilities for Reports.

5.1.1. HQ AFFSA Responsibilities. Provide the annual ATSEP Executive Summary Report and the Semiannual Trends and Analysis Report to MAJCOMs for HQ USAF/XOO. The trends and indicators included in these reports are determined using information extracted from previously published ATSEP reports, AOB meeting minutes and Hazardous Air Traffic Reports. Semiannual Trends and Analysis and annual Executive Summary Reports are exempt from RCS licensing in accordance with AFI 33-324, *The Information Collection and Reports Management Program; Controlling Internal, Public, and Interagency Air Force Information Collections*.

5.1.2. MAJCOM Responsibilities. MAJCOM evaluation team members will prepare a report for each evaluation using the format shown in **Attachment 2**. An evaluation report must be completed and distributed within 30 days of completion of the evaluation.

5.1.2.1. Use the sample cover page for the report. Include team composition and team chief signature block on the next page.

5.1.2.2. Include all required sections and subsections in each report. Indicate if there is no information for a section. Ensure the Executive Summary is consistent with information presented at the final out-brief.

5.1.2.3. In those unusual cases when system and compliance evaluations are conducted separately, do not include information in sections used for the other type evaluation. For instance, do not include SII results or observations in a compliance-only report (mark these sections as "not used"). Issues that inadvertently become apparent and might otherwise warrant an observation should be addressed in the executive summary of compliance-only reports.

5.1.2.4. ATSEP reports must be marked "FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY" when filled out and handled accordingly. ATSEP reports are exempt from RCS licensing in accordance with AFI 33-324.

5.1.2.5. Do not use technical jargon other than equipment nomenclature followed by the equipment type/name.

5.1.2.6. Unit evaluation scores and ratings are not a standard part of ATSEP; therefore, avoid the use of rating-type words (e.g., "excellent") in reports unless a rating system is specifically authorized by an approved supplement to this AFI.

5.2. ATSEP Report Content. Normally, ATSEP reports will include: Section I, Executive Information; Section II, SIIs and Observations; Section III, Problems and Off-Checklist Problems; and Section IV, General Information.

5.2.1. Section I, Executive Information. Include, as a minimum, the following:

5.2.1.1. Purpose and Scope. Use the purpose and scope statements from the sample report (**Attachment 2**) that are applicable to the evaluated system. Include definitions of an observation and a problem, if any are reported.

5.2.1.2. Executive Summary. The Executive Summary must give the host operational commander an overview of the ATSEP team's perception of the air traffic system's capability to support the flying mission (system evaluation) and how well the airfield operations and ATCALS maintenance personnel and facilities comply with established standards (compliance evaluation). It should also address significant base support functions, such as CE, that have a direct impact on mission accomplishment. Remarks should include comments on the sustainability of the air traffic system, summarized SII results (e.g., 5 SIIs evaluated, 2 were unsatisfactory), an abbreviated list of observations and a summary of problems identified. Additionally, annotate deficiencies that do not meet observation or problem criteria but may lead to degradation of mission effectiveness if unresolved. Examples are limitations or proposals to the air traffic system that cannot be resolved locally or items that impact the air traffic system that are beyond the host operational commander's jurisdiction. Identify any significant positive influence on the air traffic system environment (a system capability--not individual personality).

5.2.2. Section II, Special Interest Items (SII) and Observations.

5.2.2.1. Special Interest Items (SII). List all applicable SIIs and their evaluation results. Every unsatisfactory SII must refer to a corresponding observation.

5.2.2.2. Observations. This section includes all observation, discussion and recommendation statements as defined in paragraph **3.2.**

5.2.2.2.1. Observations will be identified by a unique tracking number consisting of the last two digits of the calendar year, the four-letter facility identifier and a sequence number (e.g., 03-EGUL-002). If a follow-up or sequential evaluation is conducted in the same year, add an alpha-character to the two-digit year portion for any new observations (e.g., 03A-EGUL-001).

5.2.2.2.2. Any observation that remains open from previous ATSEP reports shall be included and identified as a repeat observation. Repeat observations retain the tracking number from the previous report. Restate the observation verbatim from the previous report and document progress made at the end of the recommendation section. Recommendations for resolution actions may be modified, if warranted, in this addendum. Repeat observations are not necessarily more significant than newer observations, but they are usually sequenced first in reports to emphasize the importance of timely resolution.

5.2.2.2.3. An observation from a previous report that was officially closed but recurs, is considered a new observation for the purpose of tracking and standardization. Assign a new tracking number and do not refer to it as a "repeat."

5.2.3. Section III, Problems and Off-Checklist Problems.

5.2.3.1. Problems will be identified by a tracking number consisting of the last two digits of the calendar year, the four-letter aerodrome identifier, the function evaluated and the sequential order of the problem in the report (e.g., 03-EGUL-ATC-001). If a follow-up or sequential evaluation is conducted in the same year, add an alpha-character to the two-digit year portion (e.g., 03A-EGUL-ATC-004). The actual checklist number will be included in parenthesis (e.g., ATC 007) either above or at the end of each problem statement. The following identifiers must be used for specific functional area checklist items:

AM--Airfield Management

AOM--Airfield Operations Management

ATC--Air Traffic Control Operations and Training

ATCALS—Air Traffic Control and Landing Systems Maintenance

AUS—Air Traffic Control Automation System

TE—Terminal Instrument Procedures

5.2.3.2. Off-Checklist Problems Off-checklist problems will be annotated in the ATSEP report following problems in Section III. They will be tracked by assigning an OCP number instead of the functional area format assigned to checklist problems (e.g., 03-EGUL-OCP-001). Appropriate compliance reference(s) shall be included with each problem statement.

5.2.3.3. A list of problems, unresolved from previous compliance evaluations but validated as closed during the current evaluation, may be included at the end of this section.

5.2.4. Section IV, General Information.

5.2.4.1. Reply Instructions. State unit responsibilities after receipt of the final report, including specific correspondence and resolution procedures not provided elsewhere (e.g., by MAJCOM supplement).

5.2.4.2. Personnel Contacted. List key personnel who were interviewed, briefed or otherwise contributed to the report.

5.2.4.3. Distribution. List all agencies/offices to receive copies of the report. Include the number of copies for each. Minimum list is in **Attachment 2**.

5.3. Automated Reporting Procedures. To improve the reporting and trend analysis processes, AFFSA has developed the ATSEP Report Generator (ARG) database. MAJCOMs are encouraged to use ARG to conduct evaluations, generate draft ATSEP reports and create evaluation databases.

5.3.1. Evaluators collect all resultant evaluation data on their Functional Area Disks (FAD). Upload each completed FAD into the ARG.

5.3.2. Use the ARG to order and edit the basic report content. ARG automatically assigns observation and problem tracking numbers.

5.3.3. Use the ARG report feature to print a draft report or export to a document file for final editing. Do not make substantive changes to the ATSEP report (e.g., adding or deleting observations and problems or changes to tracking numbers) after exporting ARG data to a document file.

5.3.4. Forward the finalized ARG database file (report) to AFFSA/XARS.

RONALD E. KEYS, Lt General, USAF
DCS/Air and Space Operations

Attachment 1

GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

References

AFPD 13-2, *Air Traffic Control, Airspace, Airfield and Range Management*

AFI 13-203, *Air Traffic Control*

AFI 13-204, *Functional Management of Airfield Operations*

AFI 13-213, *Airfield Management*

AFI 15-180, *Air Force Weather Standardization and Evaluation Program*

FAAO 7010.1, *Air Traffic Evaluations*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AFB—Air Force Base

AFFOR—Air Force Forces

AFFSA—Air Force Flight Standards Agency

AFI—Air Force Instruction

AM—Airfield Management

AOB—Airfield Operations Board

AOF—Airfield Operations Flight

AOM—Airfield Operations Management

ARG—ATSEP Report Generator

ATC—Air Traffic Control

ATCALS—Air Traffic Control and Landing Systems

ATSEP—Air Traffic System Evaluation Program

AUS—Air Traffic Control Automation System

BASH—Bird/Wildlife Aircraft Strike Hazard

BCE—Base Civil Engineer

CE—Civil Engineering

CS—Communications Squadron

DO—Director of Operations

DoD—Department of Defense

FAA—Federal Aviation Administration

FAC—Functional Area Checklist

FAD—Functional Area Disk

MACA—Mid-air Collision Avoidance

MAJCOM—Major Command

OCP—Off-Checklist Problem

OG—Operations Group

OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility

OSS—Operations Support Squadron

RCS—Report Control Symbol

SII—Special Interest Item

SPTG—Support Group

TETERPS—Checklist Item Identifier

TERPS—Terminal Instrument Procedures

WG—Wing

Terms

Air Traffic System—All ATC, ATCALS, airfield and associated functions supporting the flying mission at a particular location. Although normally centered on a single, terminal environment, this may include enroute control, range complexes and multiple airfields.

Compliance Evaluation—The major component of ATSEP that evaluates specific functional areas within an air traffic system for compliance with USAF, FAA and MAJCOM requirements.

Follow-up Evaluation—When deemed necessary by MAJCOM, a formal assessment, conducted within 12 months of a previous ATSEP evaluation, of wing/unit progress in correcting identified deficiencies.

Knowledge Testing—If required by MAJCOM, general knowledge tests administered by evaluators to gauge the comprehension level of functional areas and for trend analysis purposes.

Observation—A deficiency identified during a system evaluation that clearly indicates actual or potential flying mission impact or an adverse affect on flight safety.

Off-Checklist Problem—A deficiency identified during a compliance evaluation indicating non-compliance with regulatory guidance (including additional MAJCOM requirements), but not resulting from a standard functional area checklist.

Problem—A deficiency identified during a compliance evaluation that indicates a functional area checklist item was found unsatisfactory for compliance with established standards (including more restrictive MAJCOM requirements) at the time it was evaluated.

Repeat Observation—An observation that remains open from a previous report. This term is not applied to a previously closed observation that recurs.

Special Interest Item—Subjective checklists used during a system evaluation to focus attention and corrective action on emergent or relatively common and significant issues. By design, an unsatisfactory special interest item results in a corresponding observation.

System Evaluation—The major component of ATSEP that evaluates, from an operational viewpoint, the air traffic system for safety, compatibility and adequacy for all users.

Tracking Number—A unique, alphanumeric code assigned to each observation and problem to facilitate the resolution process and trend analysis. \

Attachment 2

SAMPLE ATSEP REPORT

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (when filled)

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

AIR TRAFFIC SYSTEM

EVALUATION PROGRAM REPORT

Blank AFB, 27-31 July 2003

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (when filled)

Section I--Executive Information

Purpose and Scope: This evaluation was conducted to provide an assessment of the quality, adequacy, and safety of the air traffic system supporting flying operations at Blank AFB. It included: an evaluation of the air traffic system capability; air traffic and flight procedures; Air Traffic Control (ATC); Airfield Management (AM); Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPS); airspace; Air Traffic Control and Landing Systems (ATCALS) support; weather support; and Civil Engineer (CE) support. Comprehensive checklists were used to evaluate ATC, AM, TERPS and ATCALS maintenance compliance with published standards and guidance. This report identifies two levels of deficiencies: (1) Observations: air traffic system deficiencies that indicate adverse flight safety or flying mission impact, and (2) Problems: unsatisfactory checklist items in specific functional areas which reflect noncompliance with standards.

Executive Summary: The Blank AFB Air Traffic System is providing safe, efficient service to all users. Blank AFB control tower, RAPCON, and base operations facility interface well and work cohesively with base agencies. Interviews with the aviation community and review of pilot questionnaires revealed total satisfaction with the military air traffic system operation. The Mid Air Collision Avoidance (MACA) program requires increased attention to ensure a safe flying environment continues for military and civilian users.

Two Special Interest Items (SIIs) were evaluated; one was identified as unsatisfactory: Two observations were written. One is a repeat (still open) from the July 2001 evaluation about the alternate control tower facility and the other concerns qualifications of the AOF/CC.

Blank AFB airfield operations facilities/functions and ATCALS maintenance were evaluated for compliance with mandatory guidance and standards. Of 500 checklist items evaluated, 7 problems were written. Additionally, one off-checklist problem was identified.

Section II–Special Interest Items (SII) and Observations
These deficiencies affect or have the potential to affect the flying mission or flight safety.

A. Special Interest Items.

SII 0301. AOF officer qualification and certification

      Result: Unsatisfactory. See Observation 03-KBLK-001.

SII 0302. Use of air traffic control/airfield management personnel outside the AOF

      Result: Satisfactory.

B. Observations.

01-KBLK-004 (Repeat): The Blank AFB alternate control tower facility is unusable due to deteriorating window seals and unserviceable communications equipment.

Discussion: The Runway Control Structure (RCS) is designated as the alternate control tower in the event the primary control tower is evacuated or becomes unusable. The RCS has not been properly maintained. The multi-channel radios installed in the RCS are not capable of handling mission essential communications during fixed facility evacuation periods.

Recommendation: Blank AFB OSS/OSA should:

a. Ensure a higher priority is placed on CE work requests and assist in developing a periodic schedule for maintenance of the RCS.

b. Initiate a requirement for installation of fixed UHF/VHF radios and frequencies matching those located in the fixed facility.

Update: Adequate multi-channel radios have been acquired and are ready to be installed; however, the RCS structure has degraded to the point that a new facility is required. No viable alternative sites are available and the estimated replacement cost is $500K. Discussion in AOB minutes indicates that an alternate tower may no longer be required due to reduced mission flying and availability of alternate airfields. The OG/CC should determine the need for alternate ATC facilities IAW AFI 13-203 and either proceed with a replacement project or recommend closure.

03-KBLK-001: The officer assigned to the AOF/CC position is not an AFSC 13MX and, therefore, is unable to obtain/maintain AFI 13-203 certification or monitor requirements.

Discussion: AFSC 13MX officers are required to complete ATC and AM training as well as facility ratings at Officers Training Program locations prior to any assignment as an AOF/CC or AOF/DO. Without this in-depth education and training background, an officer is ill equipped to assume the responsibilities associated with an AOF.

Recommendation: The OSS/CC is responsible for managing manpower authorizations and ensuring qualified personnel are assigned. Immediate steps, through appropriate channels, should be taken to request assignment action for a 13MX to fill the AOF/CC position.

<center>**Section III–Problems/Off-checklist problems**</center>

Problems identified via standardized ATSEP checklists as items not being in compliance with USAF or FAA directives and off-checklist problems (noncompliance identified through means other than standardized checklists)

A. Problems from standard checklists.

1. **Operations**

250 checklist items evaluated, 3 problems annotated.

(03-KBLK-AOM-001) The airport surveillance radar (ASR) antenna is not being operated at the tilt angle established during the last commissioning flight inspection. (AOM 017)

(03-KBLK-ATC-002) Current sunrise and sunset tables are not maintained in the control tower. (ATC 049)

(03-KBLK-ATCALS-003) The ASR antenna tilt is incorrect (commissioned at 3.0 degrees and currently set at 2.75 degrees). (ATCALS 019)

2. **Training**

95 checklist items evaluated, 2 problems annotated.

(03-KBLK-AM-004) The CAM did not appoint a qualified training manager. (AM 084)

(03-KBLK-ATC-005) The ATC Training OI does not define procedures for reviewing training records. (ATC 132)

3. **Quality Assurance**

15 checklist items evaluated, 1 problem annotated.

(03-KBLK-TE-006) Procedures have not been reviewed annually by users to ensure they are required for mission support/training. (TE 108).

4. **Administration**

140 checklist items evaluated, 1 problem annotated.

(03-KBLK-ATC-007) RAPCON CCTLR has not put specific ACCTLR responsibilities in writing. (ATC 382)

B. Off-checklist problems:

(03-KBLK-OCP-001) Various aircraft parking apron restrictions and procedures are not included in the Wing OI or LOP. (AFIs 13-203 and -213)

Section IV–General Information

Reply Instructions:

Replies are required on observations and problems (including off-checklist) IAW AFI 13-218. The OG/CC or equivalent shall convene the Airfield Operations Board (AOB) within 30 days after receiving this report to address observations, problems and actions necessary to resolve deficiencies. AOB minutes shall reflect action taken or anticipated for each observation, including an office of primary responsibility (OPR) and an estimated closure date. Status of each open observation shall be reflected in subsequent AOB minutes until the core issues that warranted the observation have been resolved and a management control plan or action has been implemented to prevent recurrence. Recommendations for observation closure will be noted in AOB minutes and forwarded to MAJCOM OPR for airfield operations. (MAJCOM)/DO is the closure authority for observations.

(MAJCOM)/DOY is the closure authority for problems and off-checklist problems. The AOF/CC shall initiate closure requests in writing to (MAJCOM) airfield operations staff that includes actions taken to resolve deficiencies and measures implemented or planned to prevent recurrence.

Personnel Contacted:

Col Smith, 38 OG/CC

Col Jones, 38 SPTG/CC

Lt Col Katzendog, 38 OSS/CC

Lt Col Lanman, 38 CS/CC

Maj Builder, 38 SPTG/CEP

Maj Wilco, 38 OSS/OSA

Capt Guesser, 38 OSS/OSW

Lt Goforth, 38 OSS/OSA

CMSgt Fixit, 38 CS/CMBS

CMSgt Troller, 38 OSS/OSAR

SMSgt Flower, 38 OSS/OSAT

MSgt Domane, 38 OSS/OSAM

MSgt Trainor, 38 OSS/OSAT

TSgt Blackhat, 38 OSS/OSAV

Distribution:

WG/CC	1
SPTG/CC (and/or CG/CC)	1
OG/CC	1
OSS/CC	1

CS/CC	1
Numbered Air Forces	1
HQ USAF/XOOR	1
HQ AFFSA/XA	1
FAA region, if applicable	1
AFSC/SEFO	1
HQ AFMC/DOB	1
HQ AETC/	1
HQ AMC/DOA	1
HQ PACAF/DOYA	1
HQ AFSPC/	1
HQ ACC/DORO	1
HQ USAFE/DOYF	1
HQ AFRC/DOVA	1
HQ AFSOC/	1
HQ ANG/C4A/	1
(MAJCOM)/SC	1
(MAJCOM)/Weather	1
(MAJCOM)/	1

Attachment 3 (Added-AFMC)

STAFF SUMMARY SHEET

Figure A3.1. (Added-AFMC) Sample, Staff Summary Sheet.

STAFF SUMMARY SHEET							
	TO	ACTION	SIGNATURE *(Surname)*, GRADE AND DATE		TO	ACTION	SIGNATURE *(Surname)*, GRADE AND DATE
1	CS/CC	Coord		6	AFMC/ DOB	Coord	
2	OSS/OSA	Coord		7	AFMC/DO	Approve	
3	OSS/CC	Coord		8			
4	CG/CC	Coord		9			
5	ABW/CC	Coord		10			

SURNAME OF ACTION OFFICER AND GRADE	SYMBOL	PHONE	TYPIST'S INITIALS	SUSPENSE DATE
SMSgt Widgett	CS/SCML	DSN 555-1212		

SUBJECT	DATE
Closure Request, Air Traffic System Observation 02-KXXX-101, 20-24 Jul 02 ATSEP Report	

SUMMARY

1. Request closure of the following observation (TAB 1):

02-KXXX-101: The Commander's equipment certification designation letter authorized a technician to certify all ATCALS equipment when the technician was not qualified on all required tasks. This could result in an unqualified technician certifying critical ATCALS equipment.

2. The XAFB Airfield Operations Board (AOB) met on 2 Dec 02 and recommended the observations closed (TAB 2).

3. Approval request is based on the following:

CORRECTIVE ACTION:

    Implementation: The technician's certification authority was removed, the technician was trained on all the required tasks, and a certification examination was administered by AFMC AFETS on 9 Nov 02. the technician demonstrated error-free performance through four tasks and passed the written certification examination. Certification authority was returned to this technician on 22 Nov 02.
    Management Control: Internal operating instructions were changed to require that equipment certifications letters are checked by the workcenter NCOIC prior to submission for the Commander's signature. The workcenter NCOIC verifies that personnel are trained on all tasked identified on the HQ AFMC critical task listing before personnel are considered for equipment certification authority.

RECOMMENDATION: AFMC/DO approve closure of Observation 02-KXXX-101 by signing this SSS.

C. COSMIC COMMER, Major, USAF
Commander, Systems Flight

3 Tabs
   1. Extract from ATSEP Report
   2. Extract from AOB minutes
   3. Extract from Operating Instruction
   4. Other supporting documents

AF FORM 1768, 19840901 *(IMT-V1)*   PREVIOUS EDITION WILL BE USED.